

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume VII, Issue No. 12

June 2002

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

Targeting a myth

The evidence suggests that gun control has not made England a safer, fairer society

By Joyce Lee Malcolm

Americans who believe that more guns mean more crime awakened earlier this month to find, to their dismay, that the Justice Department and the federal courts had affirmed their constitutional right to be armed. Presumably, they would have preferred restrictions based on the English model, where the toughest firearms regulations of any democracy have been credited by gun control advocates with producing a low rate of violent crime.

But there are two problems with that model. When guns were freely available, England had an astonishingly low level of violent crime. A government study for the years 1890-1892, for example, found only three handgun homicides, an average of one a year, in a population of 30 million. In 1904 there were only four armed robberies in London, then the largest city in the world. One century and many gun laws later, the British Broadcasting Corp. reports that England's firearms restrictions and 1997 ban on handguns have had little impact in the criminal underworld. Guns are virtually outlawed, and, as the old slogan predicted, only outlaws have guns. And what is worse, they are increasingly ready to use them.

Five centuries of growing civility in England ended in 1954. Violent crime there has been climbing ever since, and armed crime - with banned handguns the

weapon of choice - is described as rocketing. Between April and November 2001, the number of people robbed at gunpoint in London rose by 53 percent. Last summer, in the course of a few days, gun-toting men burst into an English court and freed two defendants; a shooting outside a London nightclub left five women and three men wounded; and two men were machine-gunned to death in a residential neighborhood of North London.

Gun crime is just part of an increasingly lawless environment. Your chances of being mugged in London are now six times greater than in New York. England's rates of robbery and burglary are far higher than America's, and 53 percent of burglaries in England occur while occupants are at home, compared with 13 percent in the United States, where burglars admit to fearing armed homeowners more than the police.

This sea change in English crime is indicative of government policies that have gone badly wrong. Gun regulations have been only part of a more general disarmament based on the premise that people shouldn't need to protect themselves because society will protect them. It will also protect their neighbors. Citizens who witness a crime are advised to "walk on by" and let the professionals handle it. First, government clamped down on private possession of guns; then it forbade people carrying any article that might be used for self-defense; lastly the vigor of that self-defense was to be judged by what,

in hindsight, seemed "reasonable in the circumstances."

The 1920 Firearms Act, the first serious British restriction on guns, required a local chief of police to certify that the potential gun owner had a good reason for owning a weapon and was a fit person to have it. All very sensible. Yet over the years a series of secret Home Office instructions to police - classified until 1989 - narrowed both criteria until, in 1969, police were instructed that "it should never be necessary for anyone to possess a firearm for the protection of his house or person." Since 1997, handguns have been banned. Proposed exemptions for handicapped shooters and the British Olympic team were rejected.

Far more sweeping was the 1953 Prevention of Crime Act that made it illegal to carry any article in a public place "made, adapted, or intended" for an offensive purpose "without lawful authority or excuse." Carrying something to protect yourself was branded antisocial. Any item carried for possible defense automatically became an offensive weapon. Individuals stopped by the police and found with such items were guilty until proven innocent. As a concerned member of the House of Commons pointed out, while "society ought to undertake the defense of its members, nevertheless one has to remember that there are many places where society cannot get, or cannot get there in time. On those occasions a man has to defend himself and those whom he is escorting. It is not very much consolation that society will come

forward a great deal later, pick up the bits, and punish the violent offender."

In the House of Lords, Lord Saltoun argued that the object of a weapon was to assist weakness to cope with strength and this bill was "framed to destroy." He added that he did not think governments "have the right ... though they may very well have the power ... to deprive people for whom they are responsible of the right to defend themselves ...[u]nless there is not only a right but also a fundamental willingness amongst the people to defend themselves, no police force, however large, can do it."

But at government insistence the law passed and became permanent. A broad 1967 revision of criminal law altered the common law standard for self-defense so that everything turns on what appears "reasonable" force against an assailant, considered after the fact. As the author of a leading British legal textbook pointed out, that requirement is "now stated in such mitigated terms as to cast doubt on whether it [self-defense] still forms part of the law."

Three cases illustrate the results of these measures:

In 1987, two men assaulted Eric Butler, a 56-year-old British Petroleum executive, in a London subway car, trying to strangle him and smashing his head against the door. No one came to his aid. He later testified, "My air supply was being cut off, my eyes became blurred, and I feared for my life." In desperation he unsheathed an ornamental sword blade in his walking stick and slashed at one of his attackers, stabbing the man in the stomach. The assailants were charged with wounding. Butler was tried and convicted of carrying an offensive weapon.

In August 1999, Tony Martin, a 55-year-old Norfolk farmer living alone in a shabby farmhouse, awakened to the sound of breaking glass as two professional burglars burst into his home. He had been robbed six times before but, like 70 percent of rural English villages, his had no police presence. He sneaked downstairs with a shotgun and shot at the

intruders. Martin received life in prison for killing one burglar, 10 years for wounding the second, and 12 months for having an illegal shotgun.

In 1994, an English homeowner, armed with a toy gun, managed to detain two burglars who had broken into his house, while he called the police. When the officers arrived they arrested the homeowner for using an imitation gun to put someone in fear. Parliament is now considering making imitation guns illegal.

This is a cautionary tale. America's founders, like their English forebears, regarded personal security as one of the three great and primary rights of mankind. That was their main reason for including a right for individuals to be armed. Everyone doesn't need to avail himself of that right. It is a dangerous right. But leaving personal protection to the police is also dangerous.

The English government has come perilously close to depriving its people of the ability to protect themselves at all, and the result is a more, not less, dangerous society. "It is implicit in a genuine right," an English judge pointed out, "that its exercise may work against (some facet of) the public interest: a right to speak only where its exercise advanced the public welfare or public policy ... would be a hollow guarantee against repression."

Public safety is not enhanced by depriving individuals of their right to personal safety.

Joyce Lee Malcolm is author of *Guns and Violence: The English Experience*.

-- *Boston Globe*, May 26, 2002

The 2000 International Crime Victims Survey

Percent of people who were a victim of crime once or more in order of highest percent.

Australia
England and Wales
Scotland
Finland
Northern Ireland
Netherlands
United States
Spain

Japan

The well respected British publication, *The Economist* had this to say to the antigun British politicians... the survey results "are deeply embarrassing to a government which has promised to be tough on crime and the CAUSES of crime." The British Home Office says it has no plans to publish the findings.

To top this off the Canadian Govt has just reported since 1934 when handguns were first required to be registered not one crime has been solved due to registration.

Ed.: There is only one reason for gun control.....and that reason was always political and it will always be political in every country. Politicians naturally want to reduce or eliminate the possibility of armed resistance, period.

Gormley's Revenge

Be charged with possession of an "Assault Firearm" in New Jersey and get kicked out of your home for 2 years.

By Evan F. Nappen, Esq.

Gun owners who suffer under the [Democrat] Florio/[Republican] Gormley supported "Assault Firearm" ban are now being kicked out of their homes and businesses under the Gormley sponsored law, the "Drug Offender Restraining Order Act of 1999," (DOROA) and can be found at N.J.S. 2C:35-5.7.

Aggressive implementation of this law has now begun.

All a law abiding gun owner needs to do is be charged with possession of a so-called "Assault Firearm" and the gun law victim is automatically kicked out of his/her residence and/or business by way of a restraining order which lasts for a minimum of 2 years. It does not matter one bit that drugs were not involved. The municipal court judges have been instructed to routinely issue these DOROAS. These restraining orders are issued ex parte (without any input by the defendant or his attorney).

After the issuance of a DOROA which normally accompanies the criminal complaint, there is no hearing scheduled on the DOROA. As passed, the law is void of any due

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. – Mark Twain

process for the defendant. Just last week, I had one of these DOROAS come up in Monmouth County. My client was charged with possession of "Assault Firearm's" which are not "Assault Firearms" (Mini-14 and Ruger 10/22). I immediately went back to the municipal court judge who issued the DOROA to try to persuade the judge to vacate the order. There is a section in the law that claims that the DOROA should not be issued to remove a person from their residence unless the judge is clearly convinced that there is a need to bar the defendant in order to protect the public safety. The municipal court judge informed me that although he issued the DOROA and was sympathetic to my client's predicament, he no longer retained the jurisdiction to make any modifications to it. This is in spite of the fact that he was the court of origin for the DOROA. The judge of the municipal court claimed that as soon as he signed the DOROA kicking the defendant out of his home, he no longer retains jurisdiction and that the Superior Court now has jurisdiction.

Since there is no procedure in the DOROA law for challenging this restraining order or even affording the victim of the DOROA a hearing, my client was presented with a situation in which he had no opportunity to be heard on challenging the restraining order's issuance. I therefore created and filed emergency papers with the Superior Court to try to get my client back in his home. Fortunately, the Monmouth County Superior Court and the Monmouth County Prosecutor's Office took the appropriate action, which was initiated by my creative filings. The Monmouth County Superior Court vacated and dissolved the restraining order. By the time this had been accomplished, the law-abiding gun owner had been barred from his home for one week under the threat of jail.

My client resided with his wife in a home on 20 acres of property. On a simple charge of possession of a so-called ""Assault Firearm"" in which the defendant holds a valid New Jersey Firearms Identification Card and poses a threat to no one, my client suffered this injustice which could have lasted for years. None of these facts were presented to nor considered by

the judge of the municipal court who issued the initial DOROA.

This is a serious situation for law-abiding New Jersey gun owners. False charges for possession of an "Assault Firearm" frequently occur in New Jersey. I have personally handled many cases falsely charging "Assault Firearm" violations. These cases include the new Marlin Model 60's (which hold less than 15 rounds), Colt Match Target rifles and their clones, SKS's with a fixed magazines, 1927 Thompson/Auto Ordinance .45's, M1 Garand Rifles, MAK-90's, Marlin Camp Carbine's, Remington 7600's, Russian Dragunov's, and Springfield M1A's without a bayonet lug, just to name some of the common false charges made against law-abiding New Jersey gun owners.

In the name of "the war on drugs," be prepared to be kicked out of your home with no due process thanks to [former Gov.] Florio, [Sen.] Gormley, and [former NJ gov. and current Bush EPA administrator] Whitman.

-- Evan F. Nappen, Esq., (732-389-8888) is author of *New Jersey Gun, Knife & Weapon Laws*. For more information about New Jersey Gun Law, see www.evannappen.com

Ruger Better than S&W?

Bill Ruger was the first to come up with the bright idea of passing a law to limit magazine capacity. I haven't bought a Ruger since and I am not likely to until they admit the error of their ways and apologize.

They can die along with S&W and I'll shed no tears.
Keep Smilin'
Cogito, ergo armo

Lawmen! Consider Your Predicament with Care

By S.H., Retired Lawman

"A state cannot impose a license, tax or fee on a constitutionally protected right." -- *Murdock vs. Pennsylvania* 319 US 105 (1942)

For those who rely on constitutional law and common sense, the possession of firearms is clearly "a constitutionally protected right". Regardless of this truth, most states require a citizen to pay a "fee" (registration or background check "fee") in order to obtain a "license" (concealed carry "license") before keeping and/or bearing a firearm.

And, a federal and/or state "tax" (firearms and ammunitions sales "tax" or machine gun "tax" collected by the BATF) is always levied at the time of firearm transaction.

The U.S. Supreme Court broadly and unequivocally held that requiring licensing or registration of any constitutional right is itself unconstitutional. --*Follett vs. Town of McCormick, S.C.*, 321 U.S. 573 [1944] This rather settles the question concerning the unconstitutionality of licensing, taxation or registration of a constitutional right.

Contrary to Socialist propaganda, our Founding Fathers did not place limitations on the possession of arms - i.e.. "(After receiving a concealed weapons permit) the right (limited by 20,000 state and federal gun laws) of the people to keep (inside their perilously unhandy gun safes) and bear arms (of specific description and registered with the BATF and equipped with trigger safety locks, rendering the weapon useless for self-protection) shall not be infringed (unless feel-good solutions, opinion polls and Congress deem additional oppressive and unrealistic restrictions appropriate to their self-serving political needs)".

The germane question is, would the peoples of China, Cuba, Nazi Germany (Holocaust survivors know the answer), Soviet Russia, Kosovo, Chechnya and so on, have become victims of rape, torture and genocide, had the citizenry been well prepared with handguns and assault weapons (the real thing, fully automatic) for self-defense? With adequate weaponry at hand, along with an appropriately defensive attitude, the numbers of casualties certainly would not have counted into the millions.

Unarmed, we are all vulnerable to tyranny. In truth, it is occurring to this day. Irrespective of ongoing governmental attempts at deception (BATF, FBI, sniper Lon Horiuchi, Senator Danforth and Federal Judge Walter Smith), the federally sanctioned atrocities involving more than eighty men, women and children (shot or burned to death) at Waco and a young innocent boy (shot in the back) along with his infant bearing mother (shot in the face while nursing her baby) at Ruby Ridge, should serve as

profound examples demanding a well-armed citizenry.

In 1803 in *Marbury vs. Madison*, Supreme Court Chief Justice Marshall proclaimed that "any act of the legislature, repugnant to the Constitution, is void". Supported by his proclamation, any law or legislative act that attempts to deprive law-abiding citizens of their Constitutional rights is itself illegal and void.

Lawmen, including prosecutors, are obliged to discern "Constitutional Law" from outlaw legislation. On all occasions, conscientious officers must refuse to enforce laws that are egregiously unconstitutional (such as confiscation of Constitutionally protected firearms from honest fellow citizens). The success of law enforcement is dependent upon the goodwill of the people and a peaceful community is the result of an equal partnership between police and citizenry. Without reciprocal confidence, the consequences will be minor acts of dissension escalating into mass rebellion. Police are compelled to serve only the people and have no other master.

Lawmen! Consider your predicament with care. Your responses will be either courageous and patriotic, or cowardly and treasonous. You must defend or condemn the Constitution. There is no middle ground for you. Stand with dignity and in contrast to the majority of politicians today. Honor your oath of office.

The establishment of our Constitution demanded a display of courage and independence by a well armed citizenry. Its continued integrity will necessitate the same. Look around you. Be observant! Question all actions of government and propaganda by the biased news media (dependent on distortions and sensationalism for high ratings rather than facts). Our freedoms remain in peril to this day. It will require more than indifference, complacency, fear or blind obedience to sustain our liberties.

Thoughts on Cops

By Jim the Gunmeister

The vast majority of cops are decent people. The problem I have with cops -- whether good or

bad -- is their enforcement of unconstitutional -- and often unconscionable -- laws. Just as we rejected the Nazis' "I was just following orders" rationale at Nuremberg, so we must reject the same excuses made by American cops for violating citizens' rights.

The problem is that the "decent" cops do nothing about the "bad" cops. Time and again, we have seen coverups and attempted coverups of bad behavior. Remember how long it took for the "toilet plunger" incident in NYC to come to light? Remember all of the police denials?

Yes, we do need the cops for those things we citizens don't have the time or training to do. And I appreciate the cops for doing those things. But when a cop receives a patently illegal or immoral order to do something, he or she should attempt to get "clarification" of that order, and that failing, should simply refuse to carry it out.

Personally, however, I am not aware of such a singular act of courage occurring within the ranks of those sworn to "protect and serve," unless "Serpico" in the 1970s qualifies.

No, if they are simply going to "obey orders," let them go to Cuba and renounce their American citizenship, and serve where such an ethic is honored--but until that time they should remember that they are held to a higher standard than storm troopers of a totalitarian state.

The Snowdrop Campaign

By Roland Watson

The Centre for Defence Studies in London reports that criminal use of handguns increased by 40% in the two years immediately after the 1997 ban on handguns. In the years 1997-1998, 2,648 crimes involving handguns were reported. In 1999-2000, that number had increased to 3,685. This is not far off the peak of seven years previous, which reported 4,273 such offences.

When Anne Pearston, the prime mover in the handgun ban Snowdrop Campaign, was presented with these figures, she was reported to have said these dismissive words: "This completely misses the point of what we were trying to do. We never thought that there would be any effect on illegal gun crime, because this is a totally separate issue.

"What we were campaigning for was to make sure that a civilian

could not be legally trained to use a handgun. Our legacy is that there should never be another Thomas Hamilton, and that is what the legislation was designed to achieve."

(Thomas Hamilton on 13th March 1996 gunned to death sixteen primary school kids and their teacher in Dunblane, Scotland. He was given a renewed license despite a warning from some police about his paedophilic personality disorder).

Pearston, not content with having played a part in banning handguns, now wants the possession of airguns to be banned as well. No doubt she will move onto kitchen knives after that.

One should note her carefully constructed words. She does not say that they campaigned to make sure a civilian could never possess a firearm, but only that they may never be legally trained to use one. In other words, she knows there is nothing on earth anyone can do to stop anyone else acquiring a gun.

The Snowdrop Campaign was a good example of democracy in action. By that I mean popular opinion was mobilised against gun ownership. The State is unwittingly presiding over and forming a society increasingly predisposed to violent crime. Its ban of various weapons merely papers over the cracks of a problem they are powerless to change.

Wartime's Lost Liberties

By Douglas Carey

The terrorist attacks of September 11 have softened many people's stance on our cherished freedoms and have emboldened almost every politician to embrace new laws that severely curtail our liberty and right to privacy. Of course, the new laws and executive orders have been passed in the name of "the war on terrorism."

Some of these laws include the ability to hold a person suspected of any type of terrorist activity without charges and without showing any evidence. Secret military tribunals can now be used whereby a suspected enemy of the state can be tried by five jurists and sentenced to death by a simple majority ruling. In a final blow to everybody's rights, the Bush administration proposed that law officials should be able to listen in

on a suspect's conversation as he speaks with his lawyer.

When defending these measures, many in Washington are using a standard defense for these actions. Fearful that the American people will not stand for a loss of their hard-won liberties, many pundits and politicians have begun to look to historical precedent.

The *Wall Street Journal* ran an editorial piece with the very unnerving title, "Security Comes Before Liberty." In this editorial, Jay Winik looked to the historical actions of Abraham Lincoln, John Adams, Woodrow Wilson, and, of course, Franklin Roosevelt. His basic argument is that these presidents severely curtailed freedoms and suspended civil liberties in the name of national security and that the majority of these actions did not have any long-term effect on society.

In reality, Abraham Lincoln, the president who began the trend of more federal power and diminished states' rights, set a precedent of dictatorial actions that is still being looked to today as an excuse for more federal power. During the Civil War, Lincoln made the unprecedented move of suspending, through an unconstitutional order, the writ of habeas corpus, or the protection against unlawful imprisonment.

Also during this time, Lincoln had an estimated 13,535 people detained for merely expressing opposition to the war itself. None of these people ever even heard evidence against them and were never brought to trial. In possibly his most noticed act of despotism, Lincoln had U.S. Rep. Clement Vallandigham of Ohio arrested for "disloyal sentiments and speeches."

When the public finally rose up against this action, Lincoln released Vallandigham from prison and had him banished from the country. Even in death, Lincoln's repressive spirit lived on, as anybody who was even remotely connected with John Wilkes Booth's attempted escape after assassinating the president was hung in public or sentenced to life in prison.

President Woodrow Wilson and the Congress of the time used World War I as their excuse to curtail freedom and arrest dissenters. In 1918, the Sabotage and Sedition

Acts were passed, which allowed the federal government to punish anybody who had an expression or opinion that was "disloyal, profane, scurrilous, or abusive." Using this act, the feds at one point actually forbid the Postal Service from delivering publications that were antiwar.

Of course, no person in American history has succeeded in expanding the powers of the state more than Franklin Roosevelt. Even those who believed whole-heartedly in expanded state powers during World War II were shocked when Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, which gave the government the power to force anybody of Japanese descent out of their homes and into primitive internment camps. Over 110,000 Japanese civilians were detained in this way. Not one of them had been accused of any crime. After the war the majority of those detained went home to find their property looted and destroyed.

In uncertain times such as today, it is too easy to look the other way when the federal government expands its power and curtails our freedoms. The attorney general himself told a Senate panel: "to those who scare peace-loving people with phantoms of lost liberty, my message is this: Your tactics only aid terrorists, for they erode our national unity and diminish our resolve."

Many others say that any lost liberties will be restored once the war is past us, or once terrorism has been eradicated. Although history has shown us that the most egregious laws and orders are usually rescinded eventually, each bold step by the government has led to even bolder steps in the future.

"From the beginning," wrote Ludwig von Mises in 1919, "the intention prevailed in all socialist groups of dropping none of the measures adopted during the war after the war but rather of advancing on the way toward the completion of socialism." -
(<http://www.mises.org/nsande.asp>; *Nation, State, and Economy*)

In Mises's view, only the resistance of public opinion has prevented wartime measures from becoming permanent. Regardless of what a person's opinion is on the recent expansion of federal power, simply stating that it's been done in the past is certainly not a legitimate

argument to do the same thing today.

-- Douglas Carey is editor of <http://www.theburden.com>

Letters

To all of our brothers and sisters,

As an informed Patriot you know all too well that nothing has changed in Washington DC. The names have changed, though not much, but the toilet is the same. The group that brought you the Brady Bill and computerized gun registration are back. All thinking people know, and unthinking Brits, Aussies and Canadians, that registration is the preamble to firearms confiscation. PERIOD! That is not all that George II is up to. NAFTA, GATT WTO, UN, World Court, and the total violation of our borders are but a small part of a much longer list. The reason for the nonstop push to get the firearms has to do with the planned attack on all of our freedoms. It is only because of the militia and our patriot legal arm that things have not gotten worse.

We have done everything we can to inform people of these and many acts that have been committed by those who would destroy our nation. That is why I am asking for your help. We have doubled the number of micro FM stations around the country and more will be complete over the next few weeks. Even now we are purchasing more short wave time from all of our broadcasters so that wherever you cannot hear us on one frequency you will hear us at the same time on another.

I do believe that we are showing more and more people what is wrong and why we must fight. 17,000 Motorola employees were just laid off. We need to inform and recruit them. 25,000 Chrysler employees just lost their job. We need to inform and recruit them. All these and many more that have come to our ranks are the in-depth manufacturing and support people we need to produce what we need for the war, fight the war, and win the war! To do that we need to contact all of them and all the others who are wondering what the heck happened. To do this we need your donation sent to

Patriots Broadcast Network
P.O. Box 194
Dexter, Michigan 48130

I am asking as a brother in arms. Never will I walk away from this fight. Never will I waste what we have in our arsenal. Everything goes down range against our enemy.

I thank you for your time and your support. As always, GOD BLESS THE REPUBLIC! DEATH TO THE NEW WORLD ORDER! WE SHALL PREVAIL!

Mark Gregory,, Koernke
#295350
Chippewa Corr. Facility
Kincheloe, Michigan 49784
* * *

Dear Friends,

Thank you for your continued support of the Intelligence Report and our family.

It has been a while since I wrote you about the Radio program and our fight for Mark's freedom. We have found sponsors for 3 of the 5 days of the Intelligence Report and Kitchen Militia, broadcast on WBCQ on frequency 17.495 (no side band) from 11 am till noon.

Our son Edward has created a new internet radio site to listen to Liberty Tree Radio. He plays patriotic music and talk radio at www.libertytreeradio.4mg.com

As some may know Mark has been sending out home decontamination kit lists consisting of liquid bleach, detergent, pool bleach and antibacterial hand soap. A guard thought that these could be bomb making materials due to his "militia involvement." He was transferred to segregation (solitary). A State Police officer testified that these were possible bomb making materials. He was then placed into general population with a violent cell mate who had beaten his last three cell mates. It did not go the way they wanted. Mark called an all night talk show and said he was the one to walk out of the cell.

All I can say is thank God for hand to hand combat training!

Mark was moved back to Chippewa which is now a level 4 facility.

Thank you all so very much

for all the help that has continued for us in these trying times. Also say a prayer for Charlie Puckett, his family and our nation.

As you can see things are not moving as fast as I would like, stumbling blocks keep popping up so we have to keep jumping those hurdles and try not to break stride. Please keep us in your prayers. As always God Bless the Republic Death to the New World Order We Shall Prevail!!!

Sincerely,
Nancy Koernke

* * *

To my dear friends in New Jersey,

Greetings from Tennessee. My daughter urged me to run for the US Senate. Would you please tell folks to let Tennesseans know I am running, by emails and other.

The Lord is able to do great things and if He wants me to be elected, He can do it without money.

I appreciate your efforts for our Bill of Rights and Constitution more than you know

May the Lord bless all the God-fearing militias.

June Griffin

"We have staked the whole future of American civilization, not upon the power of governments, far from it. We have staked the future upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God." - James Madison

* * *

Dear NJM,

Thanx for sending me the newsletter. I'm sorry I can send no \$ at this time, please find enclosed a few stamps. I'm planning to send you a letter for publication in the near future detailing briefly my situation titled "I shot an escapee from the State mental hospital who was on an armed robbery spree - and I got 10 years in prison." I will be sending copies of part of the trial transcripts and discovery to confirm the most shocking details.

If you can please send one sample copy of the newsletter to radio talk show hostess Rollye James in Philadelphia. She has a show 10 pm-1 am M-F on 50,000 watt WPHT (1210 AM) and is a firm supporter of the Second Amendment, states rights, U.S. out of UN etc. She is a self-proclaimed member of the Second Amendment Sisters.

State prisoner

* * *

"The substantive rights acknowledged by the Federal Constitution define only a MINIMUM and state law may recognize liberty interests more extensive than those independently protected by the Federal Constitution; if so, the broader state protections would define the actual rights possessed by a person living within that state; state-created liberty interests are entitled to the protection of the federal due process clause." - *Mills v. Rogers*, 457 US 291 (1982)

So if on ATF Form 4473 under Section A you are not required to have purchased a local "privilege license" to possess a firearm, but under Section B a dealer is prohibited from selling you a firearm without it, how can the above Supreme Court decision have any meaning?

The Second Amendment is the MINIMUM substantive right, which at the present time is not independently protected by the Federal government when violated by state licensing.

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

militia264@aol.com

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Wake Co, NC, Dave (919) 363-9410

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____